

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,291	12/06/2005	Elliot Band	ACA6287P1US	6381
7590 05/02/2007 Ralph J Mancini Akzo Nobel inc Intellectual Property Department 7 Livingstone Avenue Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408			EXAMINER	
			DAVIS, BRIAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
•				·····
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Astion Occurrence	10/541,291	BAND ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brian J. Davis	1621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
· — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>					
·	<u> </u>					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,11 and 12</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	5) D Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/1/05</u> . 6)						

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) and 2163.06(III). Correction of the following is required: the reference to a sulfur dioxide content of less than 10 parts per million (of the dimethyl sulfate starting material). Claims 1 and 5 recite the limitation "less than 20 ppm."

The specification is also objected to because it does not contain the parentage information immediately after the title. MPEP 1893.03(c).

Claim Objections

Claim 9 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The alcohol (claim 9) cannot further limit the fatty acid (claim 8). The examiner respectfully suggests that claim 9 should properly depend from claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1621

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The list of alkanolamines is an improper Markush group due to the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of." See MPEP 2111.03 [R-3]. The examiner respectfully suggests simply deleting the word *essentially*.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are allowed. The subject matter of claims 9 and 10 would be allowable once the objection and rejection outlined above have been overcome. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The closest prior art appears to be US 3,146,267, which teaches the production and decolorization of quaternary ammonium compounds (column 2, line 34). The process of the prior art is that of the instant invention with the exception of the limitation of the SO₂ content of the dimethyl sulfate (column 4, Examples). However, the instant limitation with respect to SO₂ is of fundamental importance in the minimization of odor (rather than simply color) in the quaternary product. Case law seems clear on this point: The discovery of the cause of a problem is evidence of unobviousness, even though the solution may be obvious once the cause of the problem is known. *Eibel Process Co. v. Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.* 261 USA 45, 43 S. Ct. 322, 67 L. Ed. 523 (1923).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: JP 09067320 (CAPLUS abstract) is cited to show a related process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0638. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor Joseph McKane can be reached at 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1621

PRIMARY EXAMINER Brian J. Davis April 29, 2007

Page 5